

Appl. No. 09/035,932
Amdt. Dated June 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 24, 2004

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on June 2, 2004. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and interview, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-21 and 24-26 remain in this application. Claims 22-23 have been withdrawn.

The examiner has acknowledged that claims 14-21 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 22-23 have been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Claims 12 and 13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected parent claim, but allowable if put into independent format. In view of the examiner's earlier restriction requirement, applicant retains the right to present claims 22-23 in a divisional application.

Applicant notes that, as discussed at the personal interview, claims 24-26 were added in the response of December 8, 2003, but not examined by the Examiner in the Office action of March 24, 2004. The Examiner agreed to reopen prosecution including consideration of amendments to the claims because of this oversight.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Emery (U.S. 6,228,494) in view of one or more of Smith (U.S. 1,650,049), Middleton (U.S. 3,654,027), Molins (U.S. 3,668,045), and Onai (U.S. 4,889,963). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, amended as proposed by the Examiner, recites the step of "placing a core material onto an interior surface of a web of conductive layer material comprised substantially of non-conductive fibers". As discussed at the personal interview, none of the references suggest this element of the claim. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection of claim 1 in light of the proposed amendment.

Claims 2-5, which are dependent, directly or indirectly, on claim 1, are

Arguments/Remarks

Page 16 of 18

10
Appl. No. 09/035,932
Amdt. Dated June 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 24, 2004

patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended similarly to claim 1 as proposed by the Examiner at the personal interview, and thus is patentable over the references for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 7-9, which depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 6, are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

Claim 10 has been amended as proposed by the Examiner to recite a "continuous process". Thus, claim 10 is patentable over the references. Claims 11-13, which depend on claim 10, are thus patentable over the references for the same reasons.

Further, the Examiner has not provided the proper motivation for combining the references. In this case, it appears that the only motivation for combining the references is obtained from the application itself. There is nothing in any reference to suggest that the device of Emery should be made according to the processes disclosed in the other references. Hence, for this reason as well, the rejections cannot stand, and should be withdrawn.

Finally, claims 24-26, which were not examined by the Examiner in the response of December 8, 2003, are patentable over the references. Claim 24 has been amended to recite that an "adhesive is between and in contact with at least a portion of the core material and the web of conductive material". As discussed at the personal interview, the references do not suggest this limitation of the claim. Claim 25 depends on claim 24, and thus is patentable for at least the same reason as claim 24. Claim 26 depends on claim 1, and thus is patentable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

10
Appl. No. 09/035,932
Amdt. Dated June 18, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 24, 2004

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 31125US2.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

June 18, 2004